UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,120	03/10/2004	Samir S. Shiban	INNOVATIVE ENGINEERING	2492
James C. Wray	7590 08/21/200	EXAMINER		
Suite 300	1 D 1	JOHNSON, EDWARD M		
1493 Chain Bridge Road McLean, VA 22101			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/21/2008	PAPER

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/796,120	SHIBAN, SAMIR S.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Edward M. Johnson	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 or 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4)  Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-28 is/are withdra 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	wn from consideration. or election requirement.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct should be considered as a constant of the should be s	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/04,1/07,3/07.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/796,120 Page 2

Art Unit: 1793

### DETAILED ACTION

## Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 7/14/08 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there would be no burden on the Examiner. This is not found persuasive for reasons already of record. The Examiner's burden of searching two separate inventions classified in at least two different classes is set forth in the requirement.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

# Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPO 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is

shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. s. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because s.

Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of copending Application No. 11/206,927. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been within the purview of an ordinarily skilled artisan to claim such features a movable cleaner, inner and outer chambers, and a receiver region because the '317 application claims a heating region and filter chamber, and other corresponding features.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/796,120 Page 4
Art Unit: 1793

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward M. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1352. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley S. Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Edward M. Johnson/ Primary Examiner Application/Control Number: 10/796,120 Page 5

Art Unit: 1793

Art Unit 1793

EMJ